



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,202	04/14/2004	Najem Yaqub	02662	5873
987	7590	06/17/2009		
SALTER & MICHAELSON THE HERITAGE BUILDING 321 SOUTH MAIN STREET PROVIDENCE, RI 029037128			EXAMINER KARPINSKI, LUKE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,202

Applicant(s)

Yaqub Et Al.

Examiner

LUKE E. KARPINSKI

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-9,17,21,24,26,29-34 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-9,17,21,24,26,29-34 and 36-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/08/2009 has been entered.

Claims

Claims 2, 4, 10-16, 18-20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, and 35 are cancelled.

Claims 1, 5, and 9 are amended.

Claims 38-43 are new.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 17, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30-34, and 36-43 are currently pending and under consideration in this action.

Rejections

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Maintained Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Applicant Claims
2. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
3. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, and resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 17, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30-34, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,772,427 to Dawson et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,440,923 to Lyle et al.

Applicant Claims

Applicant claims a composition comprising an anionic surfactant, an amphoteric surfactant, a non-ionic gelling agent, and a post-foaming agent, an anionic surfactant to non-ionic gelling agent ratio of 4:1 or greater, the rigidity of said composition remaining unchanged for 4 minutes after addition of said post-foaming agent, specific compounds for said non-ionic gelling agent, including laureth-4, a percentage of said non-ionic gelling agent present, and said composition being filled into a package from which the gel is dispensed, wherein the composition is filled into said package prior to the formation of said gel.

Applicant further claims said package as an aerosol can, a percentage of surfactants present, specific compounds and percentages for said post-foaming agent, a specific anionic surfactant, said anionic surfactant as 50% or greater of total surfactant percentage, a specific amphoteric surfactant, and a method of manufacture.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

Dawson et al. teach a post-foaming gel comprising an anionic and an amphoteric surfactant and a post-foaming agent, wherein the anionic surfactant to non-ionic gelling agent (ethoxylated fatty alcohol) ratio is 4:1 (abstract), said non-ionic gelling agent

gelling agent present at 1-24%, which reads on 0.01-8% (col. 4, lines 49-54 and col. 10 examples 9 and 10 [Brij 30]), and the rigidity remaining unchanged for up to 24 hours, as well as said composition filled into packages prior to gel formation (col. 8, line 53 to col. 9, line 9) as claimed in claims 1 and 9. It is noted that ethoxylated fatty alcohol (4 lauryl alcohol) (col. 4, lines 49-65) reads non-ionic gelling agent (laureth-4), as 4-lauryl alcohol, laureth-4, and brij-30 are all synonyms.

Dawson et al. further teach lauryl alcohol (col. 4, lines 49-65) as claimed in claims 3 and 9, an aerosol can (col. 3, lines 29-31 and col. 9, lines 8-19), as claimed in claim 5, surfactants present from 3-23% and 4-26%, which reads on 0.01-30%, as claimed in claims 6 and 17, said foaming agent as an aliphatic hydrocarbon having 4-5 carbon atoms (abstract), as claimed in claims 7, 21, and 24, 5-20% foaming agent, which reads on 0.01-14%, as claimed in claims 8, 26, 29, and 30, sodium lauryl ether sulfate (col. 4, lines 22-30), as pertaining to claims 31 and 32, iso-pentane as a post foaming agent (col. 5, lines 20-26), as claimed in claims 33 and 34, and a method of manufacturing said compositions comprising combining a liquid base with a foaming agent (col. 3, lines 57-68 and col. 8, line 41 to col. 9, line 19), as pertaining to claim 9)

***Ascertainment of the Difference between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)***

Dawson et al. do not teach an amphoteric surfactant, specifically cocamidopropyl betaine, as claimed in claims 1 and 37. This deficiency in Dawson et al. is cured by

Lyle et al. teach self-foaming compositions comprising anionic and amphoteric surfactants, including cocamidopropyl betaine, (col. 8, examples 1-3).

Further, Dawson et al. do not teach said anionic surfactant present at 50% or greater of the total amount of surfactant in said compositions as claimed in claim 36. This deficiency is cured by Lyle et al. Lyle et al. teach formulations wherein the anionic surfactant is present at 50% or greater of the total percentage of surfactant in said compositions (col. 8, examples 1-2).

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)

Regarding claims 1 and 37, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to produce the formulations of Dawson et al. with an amphoteric surfactant, specifically cocamidopropyl betaine as taught by Lyle et al. in order to produce the invention of instant claims 1 and 37.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Lyle et al. teach similar foaming compositions which utilize amphoteric surfactants as well as anionic surfactants. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize the cocamidopropyl betaine of Lyle et al., with the formulations of Dawson et al. in order to utilize a different surfactant system which is known for similar compositions.

Regarding claim 36, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to produce the formulations of Dawson et

al. with anionic surfactant present at 50% or greater of the total amount of surfactant as taught by Lyle et al. in order to produce the invention of instant claim 36.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Lyle et al. teach similar foaming compositions which utilize amphoteric surfactants and anionic surfactants at percentages which read on the claimed anionic percentage. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize the surfactant system of Lyle et al., with the formulations of Dawson et al. in order to utilize a different surfactant system which is known for similar compositions.

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 17, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30-34, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,440,923 to Lyle et al. in view of US Patent No. 4,772,427 to Dawson et al.

Applicant Claims

Applicant claims a composition comprising an anionic surfactant, an amphoteric surfactant, a non-ionic gelling agent, and a post-foaming agent, an anionic surfactant to non-ionic gelling agent ratio of 4:1 or greater, the rigidity of said composition remaining

unchanged for 4 minutes after addition of said post-foaming agent, specific compounds for said non-ionic gelling agent, including laureth-4, a percentage of said non-ionic gelling agent present, and said composition being filled into a package from which the gel is dispensed, wherein the composition is filled into said package prior to the formation of said gel.

Applicant further claims said package as an aerosol can, a percentage of surfactants present, specific compounds and percentages for said post-foaming agent, a specific anionic surfactant, said anionic surfactant as 50% or greater of total surfactant percentage, a specific amphoteric surfactant, and a method of manufacture.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

Lyle et al. teach a self foaming cleansing composition comprising an anionic surfactant, an amphoteric surfactant, a post foaming agent (abstract), a non-ionic gelling agent present at 0.01-8% (lauryl alcohol, which is a synonym for laureth-4) (col. 4, lines 18-45 and col. 5, lines 7-10), and that said composition is filled into a container prior to gel formation (col. 3, lines 6-15) as claimed in claim 1.

Lyle et al. further teach a surfactant portion present from 0.01-30% (col. 7, lines 9-10) as claimed in claims 6 and 17, a aliphatic hydrocarbon foaming agent having 4-6 carbon atoms (col. 3, lines 49-55), as claimed in claims 7, 21, and 24, said foaming agent present from 0.01-14% (col. 3, lines 49-55), as claimed in claims 8, 26, and 29, said foaming agent as is pentane (col. 3, lines 49-55), as pertaining to claims 33 and 34, said anionic surfactant as sodium lauryl ether sulfate, hereafter referred to as SLS (col.

5, lines 26-67 and col. 8, lines 66-67), as pertaining to claims 31 and 32, said anionic surfactant present at 50% or greater of the total surfactant percentage (col. 8, examples 1-2), as claimed in claim 36, said amphoteric surfactant as cocamidopropyl betaine (col. 8, examples 1-3), as claimed in claim 37, and methods of manufacturing said compositions, including adding said foaming agent to said compositions and dispensing said complete compositions into containers prior to gelling (col. 2, lines 28-67), as pertaining to claim 9.

Lyle et al. also teaches problems associated with the manufacture of said compositions and solutions to said problems (col. 1, line 1 to col. 3, line 23).

The teachings of Dawson et al. are delineated above and incorporated herein.

***Ascertainment of the Difference between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)***

Lyle et al. do not teach an anionic surfactant to non-ionic gelling agent ratio of 4:1 or greater as claimed in claims 1 and 9. This deficiency in Lyle et al. is cured by Dawson et al. Dawson et al. teach a 4:1 ratio of said components (abstract).

Further, Lyle et al. do not teach said composition rigidity remaining unchanged for at least 4 minutes after the addition of the foaming agent as claimed in claims 1 and 9. This deficiency is cured by Dawson et al. Dawson et al. teach that formulations such as these may be optimized such that the gel formation does not occur for up to 24 hours (col. 8, line 64 to col. 9, lines 7).

Further, Lyle et al. do not teach an aerosol can as claimed in claim 5. This deficiency is cured by Dawson et al. Dawson et al. teach similar formulations packaged in aerosol cans (col. 3 , lines 29-31 and col. 9, lines 8-19).

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)

Regarding claims 1 and 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to produce the formulations of Lyle et al. with an anionic surfactant to non-ionic gelling agent ratio of 4:1 or greater as taught by Dawson et al. in order to produce the invention of instant claims 1 and 9.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Lyle et al. and Dawson et al. both teach to similar compositions; Lyle et al. teach the utilization and percentage ranges of both anionic surfactants and non-ionic gelling agents and Dawson et al. teach specific ratios of said components. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize the component ratio of Dawson et al, with the formulations of Lyle et al. in order to utilize known ratios for said components.

Regarding claims 1 and 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to produce the formulations of Lyle et al., with an unchanged rigidity for at least 4 minutes after the addition of the foaming agent as taught by Dawson et al. in order to produce the invention of instant claims 1 and 9.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Lyle et al. teach formation of a gel prior to said composition being dispensed into containers can cause problems and Dawson et al. teach that said formulations can be modified so that the gel forms anytime from immediately after addition of the foaming agent to 24 hours after said addition. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize the modification teachings of Dawson et al., with the formulations of Lyle et al. in order to prevent gelling to occur until said compositions had been dispensed into containers.

Regarding claim 5, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to dispense the formulations of Lyle et al. into aerosol cans as taught by Dawson et al. in order to produce the invention of instant claim 5.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Dawson et al. and Lyle et al. teach similar compositions and Dawson et al. teach that said compositions can be stored in many different containers, including aerosol containers. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize the aerosol containers of Dawson et al, with the formulations of Lyle et al. in order to utilize a container which is known to work well with said formulations.

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/08/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the instant method fills containers with said formulation prior to gelling and that Dawson et al. teach gelling prior to introduction into a final container.

This argument is not found persuasive because this limitation is taught by Dawson et al. as discussed above in the 103 rejection. Dawson et al. teach several embodiments, one of which is the addition of all components into a final container, in which the gelling takes place, and another in which said composition is introduced into a storage container, which could very well be a final container. It is viewed as obvious to add said non-gelled composition into any container.

Applicant also argues that there is no motivation to solve the same problem as that of the present invention.

This argument is not found persuasive because all embodiments taught by Dawson et al. are free of said problem. In one embodiment said compositions are maintained under pressure which maintains said compositions at a low viscosity, capable of freely moving through pipework and a second embodiment teaches adding all components of said compositions separately to the final container, after which said container is shaken to form said gel.

Applicant also argues that Dawson et al. teach that the gel compositions are always kept under pressure.

This argument is not found persuasive; although Dawson et al. do teach, in one embodiment, that said compositions are kept under pressure at all times, a second embodiment teaches that all components of said gel mixture may be added to a container which can maintain pressure, this is not to say that said components are added under pressure, simply that said container can maintain pressure, which any standard container can do, such as a gas can, barrier pack container, or juicebox. Further, with all components being added separately there is no need to maintain the delivery system under elevated pressures, as there is no risk of said separate components gelling. No one of ordinary skill in the art would choose to spend additional money to maintain a delivery system under elevated pressure if said pressures were not required. Dawson et al. also teach that it is known to maintain said mixed gel components in a liquid state for up to 24 hours, which means that said components may be added to a container, not under pressure, and remain in said container without gelling for said period of time, therefore there is no requirement to add said components to a pre-pressurized container. Further the need for a container which can maintain pressure is due to the fact that as said liquid composition gels, said composition is susceptible to expansion, without utilization of a container which is capable of maintaining pressure said gel composition would expand and possible foam and leak out of said container.

Applicant also argues that in the embodiment found in col. 9 lines 3-7, said composition is maintained and added under pressure.

This argument is not found persuasive because said gel compositions are not added to said containers, the individual components are added to and mixed in said containers.

Regarding the amendment of applied elevated pressure, this amendment does not overcome the embodiment in Dawson et al. which does not require pressure (col. 9, lines 3-7). Further applicant claims an applied elevated pressure, however Dawson et al. teach a maintained pressure, these are seen as different pressures. For example Dawson teaches maintaining pressure at 80-120psi in one embodiment, this maintained pressure plus an applied elevated pressure of 10psi would result in a total system pressure of 90-130psi. There is nothing in the claims to state that said method is not performed under a maintained pressure of 80-120psi.

Regarding the amendment of claim 5 to incorporate an aerosol can, Dawson et al. teaches the utilization of an aerosol can (col. 9, line 11).

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 17, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31-34 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 and 11-34 of copending Application No. 10/824,203. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each application teaches the same methods of making the same compositions.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Ascertainment of the Difference between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)***

Application '203 does not recite claims drawn to the compositions of the instant application, however, application '203 does teach methods of making said compositions so the compositions themselves are disclosed.

The instant application does not recite said compositions having a stability for at least 12 months at a specified temperature, however, both applications teach the same compositions and one cannot separate a compositions and its properties, therefore the compositions of the instant application would necessarily remain stable for 12 months.

***Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)***

The differences in the instant application and application '203 are in language only, the compositions and the methods of both applications are the same and either application would be seen as obvious over the other to one of ordinary skill in the art.

***New Rejections
Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 17, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30-34, and 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 4,772,427 to Dawson et al. in view of International Patent Publication WO/1997/03646 to Hall et al., US Patent 4,651,503 to Anderson III et al., and US Patent 4,405,489 to Sisbarro

Applicant Claims

Applicant claims are delineated above and incorporated herein.

Applicant further claims that no elevated pressure of 80psi or greater is required to pipe said mixtures through pipework

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

The teachings of Dawson et al. are delineated above and incorporated herein.

Ascertainment of the Difference between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims (MPEP §2141.012)

Dawson et al. do not teach a method wherein said ungelled compositions are piped through pipework without a pressure of 80psi or greater as claimed in claims 1-39. This deficiency in Dawson et al. is cured by Anderson et al. and Sisbarro. Anderson et al. teach packaging delayed forming gels and that said packaging may have problems due to high viscosity of said gel (col.1, lines15-61), and that said gel composition is mixed, in liquid form, in pipework, added to a final container, and sealed prior to formation of said gel (col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 19, and claim 1). Further,

Sisbarro teach that a pressure of 30-50psi is required to move low viscosity liquid gels through plant pipework (col. 6, lines 6-27).

Dawson et al. do not teach an amphoteric surfactant. This deficiency in Dawson et al. is cured by Hall et al. Hall et al. teach the utilization of amphoteric surfactants in post-foaming gel compositions (page 7, line(s) 8-17).

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)

Regarding the limitation of an amphoteric surfactant, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to produce the formulations of Dawson et al. with an amphoteric surfactant as taught by Hall et al. in order to produce the invention of the instant claims.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Dawson et al. and Hall et al. are analogous art, teach to similar compositions, and Hall et al. teach that such compositions may comprise a mixture of surfactants, including amphoteric surfactants. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize the amphoteric surfactants of Hall et al., within the post-foaming gel compositions of Dawson et al. in order to impart the properties and feel of an amphoteric surfactant onto said formulations.

Regarding the limitation of said gel forming after packaging into a final container, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed

invention was made to package the compositions of Dawson et al. with the methods of Anderson et al. in order to produce the invention of instant claims 1-43.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Dawson et al. and Anderson et al. both teach to post foaming gel compositions and methods of packaging and Anderson et al. teach that gelling in pipework can cause problems. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize the packaging methods of Anderson et al, with the formulations of Dawson et al. in order to avoid gelling within said pipework.

Regarding the limitations to an elevated pressure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to practice the methods of Anderson et al. with 30-50psi as taught by Sisbarro in order to produce the invention of instant claims 1-43.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Anderson et al. teach a liquid formulation pumped through pipework and Sisbarro teaches similar formulations, in low viscosity gel form, requiring 30-50psi to move said compositions through said pipework. Therefore it would have been obvious to utilize 30-50psi as taught by Sisbarro, with the methods of Anderson et al. in order to utilize a pressure known to move low viscosity compositions through pipework. It is noted by the examiner that the partially gelled formulations of Sisbarro would have a higher viscosity than the liquid formulations of either Anderson et al. or Dawson et al. and therefore would require a higher pressure to move said compositions through pipework than the later references formulations would require.

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 17, 21, 24, 26, 29, 30-34, and 36-43 are rejected.

No claims are allowed.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUKE E. KARPINSKI whose telephone number is (571)270-3501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Friday 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann R. Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LEK

*/Mina Haghighatian/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616*